### Ptx

#### First off - Immigration Reform

#### It’ll pass - pc is key

Latin American Herald Tribune 7/16 “Obama Ready to Spend Political Capital on Immigration”,

http://www.laht.com/article.asp?ArticleId=329931&CategoryId=12395

WASHINGTON – President Barack Obama told Hispanic Democratic legislators on Wednesday that he will invest his political capital in an immigration reform package whose principles will be revealed during a forum in the next two months.¶ That is what members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus reported after their first meeting with Obama on the subject of immigration.¶ In remarks to reporters, the lawmakers expressed confidence that, with the president’s support, this year the dialogue on comprehensive immigration reform will be resumed, opening a path to legalization for the country’s estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants.¶ The chairwoman of the Hispanic Caucus, New York Democratic Rep. Nydia Velazquez said that the president assured the group “he is a man of his word” and would fulfill his campaign promises to push for immigration reform.¶ Meanwhile, Sen. Bob Menendez (D-N.J.) said that during the meeting Obama assured lawmakers that he will invest part of his political capital in moving forward on immigration reform that includes strong measures for border security and a path to legalization for undocumented immigrants.¶ Menendez said that the lawmakers will work with Obama on the “principles” of that reform package, which will be presented at a public forum in the next two months with the aim of starting the dialogue about how to fix the country’s problematic immigration system.¶ “He understands that this is a matter of civil rights,” the senator said of Obama.¶ Gaining approval of a reform plan, Menendez acknowledged, will be “a struggle,” taking into account the opposition of many Republicans and other conservative groups.

**Plan drains PC – congressional fights**

Lacks congressional support – Cuban oil initiatives failed 8 times last year alone, and even supporters are divided over proper approach

**Sullivan 13**

Mark P. Sullivan Specialist in Latin American Affairs, Congressional Research Service, 6/12/13, http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R43024.pdf

**U.S. oil spill mitigation companies** can be licensed by the Treasury and Commerce Departments to **provide support and equipment in the event of an oil spill.** One such example is a Florida-based company, **Clean Caribbean** & Americas, which **has** had **licenses to be involved in Cuba** since 2001. In addition, the U.S. **Coast Guard has** obtained **licenses** from Treasury and Commerce that allow it “to broadly engage in preparedness and response activities, and positions” the agency “to direct an immediate response in the event of a catastrophic oil spill.”119 **Some** energy and policy analysts, however, **have called** for the Administration **to ease regulatory restrictions on private companies** for the transfer of U.S. equipment and personnel to Cuba needed to prevent and combat a spill if it occurs. **Interest in Cuba’s offshore oil development was strong in the 112th Congress, particularly over concerns about a potential oil spill, with** three congressional hearings held and **eight legislative initiatives introduced taking different approaches, none of which were enacted.** **The various policy approaches included: sanctioning foreign companies investing in or supporting Cuba’s oil development; requiring the Secretary of the Interior to make recommendations on a joint contingency plan** with Mexico, Cuba, and the Bahamas to ensure an adequate response to oil spills; **and authorizing U.S. companies to engage in oil spill prevention and clean-up activities in Cuba**’s offshore oil sector **as well as broader exploration and extraction activities**

#### It’s key to the economy, competitiveness, and hegemony

Shapiro 3/27 --- president and CEO of the Consumer Electronics Association, the U.S. trade association representing more than 2,000 consumer electronics companies (Gary, “Tech Executives: Immigration Reform a Top Priority”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/garyshapiro/2013/03/27/tech-executives-immigration-reform-a-top-priority/>, CMR)

Today I join hundreds of leaders in business, finance, technology and policymaking in Silicon Valley for the 2013 Global Technology Symposium. This year’s theme is “Entrepreneurship in the Global World,” a timely subject given the technology community’s leadership in supporting skilled-immigration reform, an issue intertwined with entrepreneurship and America’s standing in the global economy.¶ Entrepreneurship is a key component of “ninja innovation,” a term I coined to describe the principles we must embrace if we’re going to success in business, politics or our personal lives. I look forward to talking more about this important connection at the symposium tonight, but at the core of the discussion is a simple truth: More than being entrepreneurial individuals, we must foster a culture of entrepreneurship in America. That includes finding ways to attract and keep the world’s best and brightest innovators in America to develop products, launch companies, and create jobs.¶ CEOs from AT&T, Cisco, eBay, Facebook, Google, Intel and Yahoo! have led a steady drumbeat in Washington to reform America’s skilled-immigration system. They understand why reform is vital to our nation’s economic well-being.¶ It fuels job creation.¶ A recent study found that the average foreign-born student who graduates from a U.S. university and works in a STEM field – science, technology, engineering and mathematics – will create about 2.62 jobs for American workers.¶ Creating an immigration system that welcomes the world’s best and brightest is not only crucial to our nation but also to the San Jose-Sunnyvale-Santa Clara economy, home to thousands of STEM jobs. A 2011 Bureau of Labor Statistics report finds that STEM occupations accounted for at least 15 percent of total jobs in this area – that’s more than three times the percentage for the U.S. as a whole.¶ That’s why earlier this month, more than 100 executives from the technology sector and leading innovation advocacy organizations, including my organization, the Consumer Electronics Association (CEA)®, signed a letter to President Obama and Congress urging them to create a more open and flexible U.S. immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers.¶ Cisco Chairman and CEO John Chambers said it best, “America’s success has been based upon its ability to attract the best, brightest, and most ambitious individuals. Our country needs a modern immigration policy that further fosters this culture to help spur continued technological innovation and economic growth.”¶ The problem is clearest in the technology industry because of the incredible shortage of qualified workers. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there are tens of thousands of unfilled jobs requiring highly skilled individuals in STEM fields. Among four top tech firms – IBM, Intel, Microsoft and Oracle – there are 10,000 jobs waiting to be filled.¶ Our outdated and inefficient immigration system is a huge contributor to the shortage. Many high-skilled, foreign-born workers want to come to or stay in America and create jobs here, but our restrictive visa laws send them home after they’ve trained in our universities. Silicon Valley has felt the pain of these policies through a drop in the number of startups founded by foreign-born immigrants. In the past seven years, immigrants founded 43.9 percent of startups, down from 52.4 percent in 2005. Pushing these individuals to the back of the immigration line creates an incentive for them to compete against us by working for other companies abroad.¶ Instead, we should implement reforms like the Immigration Innovation Act, which would nearly double the number of H-1B visas for high-skilled foreign workers.¶ Other measures, like the Start-Up Visa Act, introduced in the Senate, would also encourage innovation here in the U.S. while investing in education for those in STEM fields. These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter to President Obama and Congress as ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. But that doesn’t mean that if Congress and the President fail to enact them the technology industry will not surrender its fight for reform.¶ The Startup Act 3.0 would enhance America’s global competitiveness by encouraging more entrepreneurialism and halt the U.S. brain drain by creating a STEM visa program for up to 50,000 immigrants each year who graduate from U.S. institutions with a master’s or Ph.D. in STEM. It would also create an entrepreneur visa for up to 75,000 immigrant entrepreneurs who register a business, hire at least two non-family member employees, and invest in their business within one year of obtaining the visa.¶ These policy prescriptions were included in the tech leaders’ letter ways to start the debate and come to a compromise. If Congress and the President fail to enact them, the technology industry will keep fighting for reform.¶ After all, the understanding that strategic immigration is good for our economy is gaining traction among the broader public as well. A recent survey found that there is strong desire among likely voters to have an open and flexible immigration system that embraces highly skilled workers. It also found broad support for research and development programs and a stronger federal focus on STEM education. This may be because Americans are becoming increasingly worried that we are losing our global advantage. More Americans believe that the next major technological innovation will come from China (43 percent) rather than from America (30 percent).¶ With the support of most Americans and the bold leadership of tech industry executives, skilled immigration reform should be a no-brainer in Washington. Bipartisan reform is an important and remarkably easy way to help create jobs and innovation at home. We need to keep America in a position of global leadership, and reforming our country’s immigration law is the first step.

#### Extinction

Barnett 11 (Thomas P.M., Former Senior Strategic Researcher and Professor in the Warfare Analysis & Research Department, Center for Naval Warfare Studies, U.S. Naval War College American military geostrategist and Chief Analyst at Wikistrat., worked as the Assistant for Strategic Futures in the Office of Force Transformation in the Department of Defense, “The New Rules: Leadership Fatigue Puts U.S., and Globalization, at Crossroads,” March 7, CMR)

Events in Libya are a further reminder forAmericans that we stand at a crossroads in our continuing evolution as the world's sole full-service superpower. Unfortunately, we are increasingly seeking change without cost, and shirking from risk because we are tired of the responsibility. We don't know who we are anymore, and our president is a big part of that problem. Instead of leading us, he explains to us. Barack Obama would have us believe that he is practicing strategic patience. But many experts and ordinary citizens alike have concluded that he is actually beset by strategic incoherence -- in effect, a man overmatched by the job. It is worth first examining the larger picture: We live in a time of arguably the greatest structural change in the global order yet endured, with this historical moment's most amazing feature being its relative and absolute lack of mass violence. That is something to consider when Americans contemplate military intervention in Libya, because if we do take the step to prevent larger-scale killing by engaging in some killing of our own, we will not be adding to some fantastically imagined global death count stemming from the ongoing "megalomania" and "evil" of American "empire." We'll be engaging in the same sort of system-administering activity that has marked our stunningly successful stewardship of global order since World War II. Let me be more blunt: **As the guardian of globalization**, **the U.S. military has been the** greatest force for peace the world has ever known. **Had America been removed from the global dynamics that governed the 20th century**, the **mass murder never would have ended**. Indeed, it's entirely conceivable **there would now be** no identifiable human civilization left**, once** nuclear weapons **entered the killing equation.**  But **the world did not keep sliding down that path of perpetual war**. **Instead, America stepped up and changed everything by ushering in our now-**perpetual great-power peace. **We introduced the international liberal trade order known as** globalization and played loyal Leviathan over its spread. **What resulted was the collapse of empires,** an explosion of democracy, the persistent spread of human rights, the liberation of women, the doubling of life expectancy, a roughly 10-fold increase in adjusted global GDP **and a profound and persistent reduction in battle deaths from** state-based conflicts. That is what American "hubris" actually delivered. Please remember that the next time some TV pundit sells you the image of "unbridled" American military power as the cause of global disorder instead of its cure. With self-deprecation bordering on self-loathing, we now imagine a post-American world that is anything but. Just watch who scatters and who steps up as the Facebook revolutions erupt across the Arab world. While we might imagine ourselves the status quo power, we remain the world's most vigorously revisionist force. As for the sheer "evil" that is our military-industrial complex, again, let's examine what the world looked like before that establishment reared its ugly head. The last great period of global structural change was the first half of the 20th century, a period that saw a death toll of about 100 million across two world wars. That comes to an average of 2 million deaths a year in a world of approximately 2 billion souls. Today, with far more comprehensive worldwide reporting, researchers report an average of less than 100,000 battle deaths annually in a world fast approaching 7 billion people. Though admittedly crude, these **calculations suggest a 90 percent absolute drop and a** 99 percent **relative** drop in deaths due to war. We are clearly headed for a world order characterized by multipolarity, something the American-birthed system was designed to both encourage and accommodate. But given how things turned out the last time we collectively faced such a fluid structure, **we would do well to keep U.S. power, in all of its forms**, deeply embedded in the geometry to come. To continue the historical survey, after salvaging Western Europe from its half-century of civil war, the U.S. emerged as the progenitor of a new, far more just form of globalization -- one based on actual free trade rather than colonialism. America then successfully replicated globalization further in East Asia over the second half of the 20th century, setting the stage for the Pacific Century now unfolding.

### Drilling CP

#### Text: The United States federal government should increase drilling within the United States and its territorial waters.

#### Expanding US drilling solves their case and doesn’t link to politics or the K.

Jillian L. Genaw (J.D. Candidate, Indiana Univ. School of Law-Indianapolis – Indiana International & Comparative Law Review) 2010 Indiana Internationsl & Comparative Law Review

As an alternate option to the United States' lifting its OCS Moratorium, policy analysts have suggested that the United States keep the Moratorium in place but lift the economic embargo against Cuba in order to enable the United States to bid on the offshore blocs that Cuba plans to lease out to foreign nations. n225 While a discussion of the economic embargo goes well beyond the scope of this Note, it is important to take notice that it is an option that has been placed on the table. Even without a full discussion of this option, the main concerns with it can shed some light on its viability. As discussed in Part I of this Note, it makes little sense for the United States to lift an economic embargo, which has been in place since 1962, just to lease Cuban offshore drilling blocs that are so close to the U. S. coast that they would subject the United States to the same risks of environmental degradation. n226 Granted, lifting the economic embargo on Cuba would be beneficial in other areas of [\*76] trade, but if the primary motive for lifting the embargo is offshore oil drilling related then it makes very little sense. n227 There are much more accessible, less controversial avenues for allowing offshore drilling in the United States. By lifting the OCS Moratorium the United States would achieve the same benefits as it would if it leased drilling blocs from Cuba, but would also achieve greater control and oversight over the industry. n228¶ If the United States does not take action and lift the OCS Moratorium, in combination with imposing the other recommended environmental and safety regulations, it will remain heavily dependant on foreign nations for oil. Even more daunting, the United States will be forced to sit back and watch as Cuba and other nations reap the economic benefits of a substantial supply of oil so close to its own coastline. After years of debate amongst extremists on both sides of the political spectrum, the issue of offshore drilling in the OCS has been stagnated. In light of Cuba's plans to expand its oil program and with the introduction of improved technology, the environmental arguments, once convincing against offshore drilling, are now weak. After all, lifting the OCS Moratorium does not give oil companies free reign; American oil companies will be subject to strengthened technological and safety regulations, more frequent inspections, and more severe sanctions in the event of non-compliance. Because there is little the United States can do to prevent Cuba from leasing out offshore exploration blocs, located within forty-five miles of the U. S. coastline, it is wise for the United States to be proactive. If offshore drilling is to be done so close to the United States, it should be done the United States' way. As discussed in Part III of this Note, environmental policy in Cuba has historically lacked enforcement and the public has little knowledge of and appreciation for the environmental risks associated with offshore drilling. n229 Thus, the regulations over offshore drilling imposed by the Cuban government would likely be much less stringent than regulations imposed by the U. S. Government.¶ The American public, American businesses, and even some environmentalists have become increasingly supportive of opening up the OCS for offshore oil drilling. n230 Drilling technology and methodology have made major advancements, and the oil industry's reputation has become cleaner since the 1980s when the OCS Moratorium was first enacted. The United States' economy would be stimulated by participation in offshore oil drilling. The benefits are growing, and the risks have minimized. Thus, the optimal solution would be for the United States to lift the OCS Moratorium, with the directional [\*77] drilling method mandated where possible, increase the frequency of inspections, strengthen enforcement, make sanctions more severe, and create an "oil legacy" fund in preparation for a transition into more sustainable energy development. n231 The United States should continue to research other renewable, alternative energy sources as well. Taking these steps will allow the United States to remain competitive in the international marketplace, develop a self- sufficient energy sector, solve a political battle that has been looming for years, and minimize any negative impact associated with Cuba's offshore exploration bloc leasing program.

### K

#### **Expanding globalization to Cuba is part of an imperial strategy to displace revolutionary potential in Cuba. The outcome of the expansion of globalization is environmental destruction and inequality.**

Bliss 2005 (Dr. Susan Bliss: Director of Global Education, 7/5/2005, “Sustainability of Modern Cuba’s post revolution globalisation process”,)

Globalisation is not a new phenomenon in Cuba, evolving from the 16th century with the first expansion of European capitalism and accelerating from 1870-1914 with increased transport of goods. But while the world became more globalized driven by falling trade barriers (1950-1980) and deregulation of financial institutions (1980s) Cuba experienced restricted globalisation because of US imposed sanctions (1960s- 2005). Since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, ushering in perestroika and glasnost, globalisation has threatened to engulf Cuba that has responded by developing a unique blend of both globalisation and localisation (glocalisation) emphasising heterogeneous development and cultural exclusiveness transforming the economy and society from late 19th century. Many Cubans still fervently adhere to strict egalitarian values of the revolution (Stokes, 2003) arguing that western, materialistic globalisation ignores its dysfunctional aspects, such as environmental degradation, loss of community, social inequality and needs to look at possible multiple, eclectic approaches to societal development (Toffler, 1990) for the development of a more sustainable, equitable future. For Castro, the global economy is an uneven playing field holding many dangers for small, developing countries, like Cuba, as it works towards a difficult blend of global market and restricted state and civil society economic management. For Cubans globalisation has a substantive meaning (transcontinental circuits of capital, trade and production) but an ideological use (neo-liberalism) that grew with the demise of the socialist bloc in early 1990s and had profound effects on the legitimacy of Cuban socialism, as an alternative to capitalism. Most Cuban socialists support anti-globalisation as they envisage the US as the main driving force advocating financial imperatives and the rule of the strong. In contrast Cubans believe it should be replaced with a socialist system that promotes equality and shared values of humanity and markets that are ‘free and fair’, equitably structured and immune from corporate power.

#### The modus operandi of the affirmative’s economics is the historical drive behind colonization and mass violence against Latin America culminating in wars, violence and genocide in the name of their economic ideals

Escobar 2004 [Arturo, Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality, and Anti-Globalization Social Movements, Third world quarterly 2004. www.nd.edu/~druccio/Escobar.pdf‎]

One of the main consequences, for Santos, of the collapse of emancipation into regulation is the structural predominance of exclusion over inclusion. Either because of the exclusion of many of those formerly included, or because those who in the past were candidates for inclusion are now prevented from being so, the problematic of exclusion has become terribly accentuated, with ever growing numbers of people thrown into a veritable “state of nature.” The size of the excluded class varies of course with the centrality of the country in the world system, but it is particularly staggering in Asia, Africa and Latin America. The result is a new type of social fascism as “a social and civilizational regime” (p. 453). This regime, paradoxically, coexists with democratic societies, hence its novelty. This fascism may operate in various modes: in terms of spatial exclusion; territories struggled over by armed actors; the fascism of insecurity; and of course the deadly financial fascism, which at times dictates the marginalization of entire regions and countries that do not fulfill the conditions needed for capital, according to the IMF and its faithful management consultants (pp. 447-458). To the former Third World corresponds the highest levels of social fascism of these kinds. This is, in sum, the world that is being created by globalization from above, or hegemonic globalization. Before moving on, it is important to complete this rough representation of today’s global capitalist modernity by looking at the US-led invasion of Iraq in early 2003. Among other things, this episode has made at last two things particularly clear: first, the willingness to use unprecedented levels of violence to enforce dominance on a global scale; second, the unipolarity of the current empire. In ascension since the Thatcher-Reagan years, this unipolarity reached its climax with the post-9/11 regime, based on a new convergence of military, economic, political and religious interests in the United States. In Alain Joxe’s (2002) compelling vision of imperial globality, what we have been witnessing since the first Gulf War is the rise of an empire that increasingly operates through the management of asymmetrical and spatialized violence, territorial control, sub-contracted massacres, and “cruel little wars,” all of which are aimed at imposing the neo-liberal capitalist project. At stake is a type of regulation that operates through the creation of a new horizon of global violence. This empire regulates disorder through financial and military means, pushing chaos to the extent possible to the outskirts of empire, creating a “predatory” peace to the benefit of a global noble caste and leaving untold poverty and suffering in its path. It is an empire that does not take responsibility for the wellbeing of those over whom it rules. As Joxe puts it: “The world today is united by a new form of chaos, an imperial chaos, dominated by the imperium of the United States, though not controlled by it. We lack the words to describe this new system, while being surrounded by its images. ... World leadership through chaos, a doctrine that a rational European school would have difficulty imagining, necessarily leads to weakening states –even in the United States—through the emerging *sovereignty* of corporations and markets.” (2002: 78, 213). 7 The new empire thus operates not so much through conquest, but through the imposition of norms (free-markets, US-style democracy and cultural notions of consumption, and so forth). The former Third World is, above all, the theatre of a multiplicity of cruel little wars which, rather than barbaric throwbacks, are linked to the current global logic. From Colombia and Central America to Algeria, sub-Saharan Africa and the Middle East these wars take place within states or regions, without threatening empire but fostering conditions favorable to it. For much of the former Third World (and of course to the Third World within the core) is reserved “the World-chaos” (107), free-market slavery, and selective genocide. In some cases, this amounts to a sort of “paleo-micro- colonialism” within regions (157), in others to balkanization, in yet others to brutal internal wars and massive displacement to free up entire regions for transnational capital (particularly in the case of oil, but also diamonds, timber, water, genetic resources, and agricultural lands). Often times these cruel little wars are fueled by Mafia networks, and intended for macro-economic globalization. It is clear that this new Global Empire (“the New World Order of the American imperial monarchy,” p. 171) articulates the “peaceful expansion” of the free-market economy with omnipresent violence in a novel regime of economic and military globality –in other words, the global economy comes to be supported by a global organization of violence and vice versa (200). On the subjective side, what increasingly one finds in the Souths (including the South within the North) are “diced identities” and the transformation of cultures of solidarity into cultures of destruction.

#### The question of this debate is how best to challenge colonial institutions and foreground the lives of marginalized populations – this is an ethical imperative.

Mignolo 2009 (Walter Mignolo, 2009, Epistemic Disobedience, Independent thought, and deconlonial freedom, <http://waltermignolo.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/03/epistemicdisobedience-2.pdf>, Walter Mignolo is a semiotician and Professor at Duke Univeristy, who has published extensively on semiotics and literary theory, and worked on different aspect of the modern and colonial world, exploring concepts such as global coloniality, the geopolitics of knowledge, transmodernity, border thinking, and pluriversality)

De-colonial thinking presupposes de-linking (epistemically and politically) from the web of imperial knowledge (theo- and ego-politically grounded) from disciplinary management. A common topic of conversation today, after the ﬁnancial crisis on Wall Street, is ‘how to save capitalism’. A de-colonial question would be: ‘Why would you want to save capitalism and not save human beings? Why save an abstract entity and not the human lives that capitalism is constantly destroying?’ In the same vein, geo- and body-politics of knowledge, de-colonial thinking and the de-colonial option place human lives and life in general ﬁrst rather than making claims for the ‘transformation of the disciplines’. But, still, claiming life and human lives ﬁrst, de-colonial thinking is not joining forces with ‘the politics of life in itself’ as Nicholas Rose (2007) has it. Rose’s ‘politics of life in itself’ is the last development in the ‘mercantilization of life’ and of ‘bio-power’ (as Foucault has it). In the ‘politics of life in itself’ political and economic strategies for controlling life at the same time as creating more consumers join forces. Bio-politics, in Foucault’s conception, was one of the practical consequences of an ego-politics of knowledge implemented in the sphere of the state. Politics of life in itself extends it to the market. Thus, politics of life in itself describes the enormous potential of bio-technology to generate consumers who invest their earnings in buying health-promoting products in order to maintain the reproduction of technology that will ‘improve’ the control of human beings at the same time as creating more wealth through the money invested by consumers who buy health-promoting technology.

#### Our alternative is to reject the affirmative – when confronted with colonial projects the only ethical response is radical negativity. We are compelled to be disobedient to modernity.

Mignolo 09 [Walter D. Mignolo, Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom, Theory and Culture 2009, published 2009]

ONCE UPON a time scholars assumed that the knowing subject in the disciplines is transparent, disincorporated from the known and untouched by the geo-political configuration of the world in which people are racially ranked and regions are racially configured. From a detached and neutral point of observation (that Colombian philosopher Santiago Castro-Gómez (2007) describes as the *hubris of the zero point*), the knowing subject maps the world and its problems, classifies people and projects into what is good for them. Today that assumption is no longer tenable, although there are still many believers. At stake is indeed the question of racism and epistemology (ChukwudiEze, 1997; Mignolo, forthcoming). And once upon a time scholars assumed that if you ‘come’ from Latin America you have to ‘talk about’ Latin America; that in such a case you have to be a token of your culture. Such expectation will not arise if the author ‘comes’ from Germany, France, England or the US. In such cases it is not assumed that you have to be talking about your culture but can function as a theoretically minded person. As we know: the first world has knowledge, the third world has culture; Native Americans have wisdom, Anglo Americans have science. The need for political and epistemic delinking here comes to the fore, as well as decolonializing and decolonial knowledges, necessary steps for imagining and building democratic, just, and non-imperial/colonial societies. Geo-politics of knowledge goes hand in hand with geo-politics of knowing. Who and when, why and where is knowledge generated (rather than produced, like cars or cell phones)? Asking these questions means to shift the attention from the enunciated to the enunciation. And by so doing, turning Descartes’s dictum inside out: rather than assuming that thinking comes before being, one assumes instead that it is a racially marked body in a geo-historical marked space that feels the urge or get the call to speak, to articulate, in whatever semiotic system, the urge that makes of living organisms ‘human’ beings. By setting the scenario in terms of geo- and body-politics I am starting and departing from already familiar notions of ‘situated knowledges’. Sure, all knowledges are situated and every knowledge is constructed. But that is just the beginning. The question is: who, when, why is constructing knowledges (Mignolo, 1999, 2005 [1995])? Why did eurocentered epistemology conceal its own geo-historical and bio-graphical locations and succeed in creating the idea of universal knowledge as if the knowing subjects were also universal? This illusion is pervasive today in the social sciences, the humanities, the natural sciences and the professional schools. Epistemic disobedience means to delink from the illusion of the zero point epistemology. The shift I am indicating is the anchor (constructed of course, located of course, not just anchored by nature or by God) of the argument that follows. It is the beginning of any epistemic decolonial de-linking with all its historical, political and ethical consequences. Why? Because geo-historical and bio-graphic loci of enunciation have been located by and through the making and transformation of the colonial matrix of power: a racial system of social classification that invented Occidentalism (e.g. IndiasOccidentales), that created the conditions for Orientalism; distinguished the South of Europe from its center (Hegel) and, on that long history, remapped the world as first, second and third during the Cold War. Places of nonthought (of myth, non-western religions, folklore, underdevelopment involving regions and people) today have been waking up from the long process of westernization. The anthropos inhabiting non-European places discovered that s/he had been invented, as anthropos, by a locus of enunciations self-defined as humanitas. Now, there are currently two kinds or directions advanced by the former anthropos who are no longer claiming recognition by or inclusion in the humanitas, but engaging in epistemic disobedience and de-linking from the magic of the Western idea of modernity, ideals of humanity and promises of economic growth and financial prosperity (Wall Street dixit). One direction unfolds within the globalization of a type of economy that in both liberal and Marxist vocabulary is defined as ‘capitalism’. One of the strongest advocates of this is the Singaporean scholar, intellectual and politician Kishore Mahbubani, to which I will return later. One of his earlier book titles carries the unmistakable and irreverent message: Can Asians Think?: Understanding the Divide between East and West (2001). Following Mahbubani’s own terminology, this direction could be identified as de-westernization. Dewesternization means, within a capitalist economy, that the rules of the game and the shots are no longer called by Western players and institutions. The seventh Doha round is a signal example of de-westernizing options. The second direction is being advanced by what I describe as the decolonial option. The decolonial option is the singular connector of a diversity of decolonials. The decolonial paths have one thing in common: the colonial wound, the fact that regions and people around the world have been classified as underdeveloped economically and mentally. Racism not only affects people but also regions or, better yet, the conjunction of natural resources needed by humanitas in places inhabited by anthropos. De colonial options have one aspect in common with de-westernizing arguments: the definitive rejection of ‘being told’ from the epistemic privileges of the zero point what ‘we’ are, what our ranking is in relation to the ideal of humanitas and what we have to do to be recognized as such. However, decolonial and de-westernizing options diverge in one crucial and in disputable point: while the latter do not question the ‘civilization of death’ hidden under the rhetoric of modernization and prosperity, of the improvement of modern institutions (e.g. liberal democracy and an economy propelled by the principle of growth and prosperity), decolonial options start from the principle that the regeneration of life shall prevail over primacy of the production and reproduction of goods at the cost of life (life in general and of humanitas and anthropos alike!). I illustrate this direction, below, commenting on ParthaChatterjee’s re-orienting ‘eurocentered modernity’ toward the future in which ‘our modernity’ (in India, in Central Asia and the Caucasus, in South America, briefly, in all regions of the world upon which eurocentered modernity was either imposed or ‘adopted’ by local actors assimilating to local histories inventing and enacting global designs) becomes the statement of interconnected dispersal in which decolonial futures are being played out. Last but not least, my argument doesn’t claim originality (‘originality’ is one of the basic expectations of modern control of subjectivity) but aims to make a contribution to growing processes of decoloniality around the world. My humble claim is that geo- and body-politics of knowledge has been hidden from the self-serving interests of Western epistemology and that a task of decolonial thinking is the unveiling of epistemic silences of Western epistemology and affirming the epistemic rights of the racially devalued, and decolonial options to allow the silences to build arguments to confront those who take ‘originality’ as the ultimate criterion for the final judgment.1

### Economy Adv

#### On their uniqueness, Venezuela won’t cut off our supply because 95% of their GDP comes from oil exports so they are unlikely to cut anyone off or else they risk losing billions of dollars’ worth of revenue.

#### New election proves – cutoff is unlikely

AP 4/15 (Associated Press, “Cuba avoids oil cutoff for now as Chavez ally narrowly wins Venezuela presidential election”, 2013, http://www.foxnews.com/world/2013/04/15/cuba-avoids-oil-cutoff-for-now-as-chavez-ally-narrowly-wins-venezuela/)

Cubans are relieved that the late Venezuelan leader Hugo Chavez's hand-picked successor has been elected president. The island nation has benefitted from billions of dollars in subsidized oil under Chavez. New President Nicolas Maduro is seen as an ideological ally who will want to continue the countries' special relationship. But Maduro's razor-thin victory margin has his rival demanding a recount, and experts warn that Cuba's relief could be short-lived. Cuban President Raul Castro was among the first to congratulate Maduro in a note that was published Monday in Communist Party newspaper Granma.

#### No drilling in the squo – all companies have bailed.

Mary O'Grady (is a member of the editorial board at The Wall Street Journa) WSJ – April 24, 2013 http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887324474004578442511561458392.html

Then came promises of an oil boom and last week the predictable bust. The Brazilian state-owned Petrobras PETR4.BR +1.01% had given up on deep-sea drilling in Cuban waters in 2011. Repsol REP.MC -2.46% gave up in May 2012. The deep water platform it was using was then passed to Malaysia's state-owned Petronas, which also came up empty. Venezuela's PdVSA had no luck either. In November Cuba announced that the rig that had been in use would be heading to Asia. Last week came the end of shallow-water drilling.

#### US standards are met – SQuo solves

Geman 12 (Ben, “Interior: Cuba-bound drilling rig ‘generally’ meets US standards”, 1/9, http://thehill.com/blogs/e2-wire/e2-wire/203161-interior-cuba-bound-drilling-rig-generally-meets-us-standards)

The deepwater drilling rig that Spanish oil giant Repsol will use for planned oil exploration off Cuba’s coast is getting a clean bill of health from U.S. officials. The United States has no regulatory authority over the drilling, but an Interior Department and Coast Guard team was invited to inspect the Scarabeo 9 rig by Repsol, a check-up that comes as planned drilling off Cuba’s coast draws criticism from several U.S. lawmakers. “The review compared the vessel with applicable international safety and security standards as well as U.S. standards for drilling units operating in the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf. U.S. personnel found the vessel to generally comply with existing international and U.S. standards by which Repsol has pledged to abide,” the U.S. agencies said in a joint statement Monday upon completion of the review. The U.S. team reviewed drilling equipment, safety systems such as firefighting equipment and the unit’s blowout preventer and other aspects of the rig. A number of U.S. lawmakers critical of the Cuban government have criticized Repsol’s planned project, noting it will bring revenues to the Cuban regime and that a spill could threaten nearby U.S. shores. More on that here, here and here. “The review is consistent with U.S. efforts to minimize the possibility of a major oil spill, which would hurt U.S. economic and environmental interests,” Interior and the Coast Guard said of the inspection, which occurred off the coast of Trinidad and Tobago.

#### Even if bio-terrorism could cause extinction, bio-terrorism is unlikely to even happen -empirical record proves that terrorists can’t develop them

Gregory D. Koblentz, Assistant Professor, Department of Public and International Affairs and Deputy Director, Biodefense Program, George Mason University, "Biosecurity Reconsidered," INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, Spring 2010, p. 96+, ASP.

The threat of bioterrorism, may not be as severe as some have portrayed it to be. Few terrorist groups have attempted to develop a biological weapons capability, and even fewer have succeeded. Prior to the anthrax letter attacks in 2001, only one group, the disciples of guru Bhagwan Shree Rajneesh in Oregon, managed to cause any casualties with a biological agent. 86 The U.S. intelligence community estimates that of the fifteen terrorist groups that have expressed an interest in acquiring biological weapons, only three have demonstrated a commitment to acquiring the capability to cause mass casualties with these weapons. 87 Groups such as Japan's Aum Shinrikyo and al-Qaida have demonstrated the desire to cause mass casualties and an interest in using disease as a weapon. Despite concerted efforts by both groups to produce deadly pathogens and toxins, however, neither has caused any casualties with such weapons, let alone developed a weapon capable of causing mass casualties. The failures experienced by these groups illustrate the significant hurdles that terrorists face in progressing beyond crude weapons suitable for assassination and the contamination of food supplies to biological weapons based on aerosol dissemination technology that are capable of causing mass casualties. 88

#### No impact to naval power

Tillman 9 (Barrett Tillman, Historian specializing in naval and aviation topics, 2009. U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings Magazine, “Fear and Loathing in the Post-Naval Era,” http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/story.asp?STORY\_ID=1896)

In attempting to justify a Cold War force structure, many military pundits cling to the military stature of China as proof of a possible large conventional-war scenario against a pseudo-peer rival. Since only China possesses anything remotely approaching the prospect of challenging American hegemony—and only in Asian waters—Beijing ergo becomes the "threat" that justifies maintaining the Cold War force structure. China's development of the DF-21 long-range antiship ballistic missile, presumably intended for American carriers, has drawn much attention. Yet even granting the perfection of such a weapon, the most obvious question goes begging: why would China use it? Why would Beijing start a war with its number-two trading partner—a war that would ruin both economies?10 Furthermore, the U.S. Navy owns nearly as many major combatants as Russia and China combined. In tonnage, we hold a 2.6 to 1 advantage over them. No other coalition—actual or imagined—even comes close. But we need to ask ourselves: does that matter? In today's world the most urgent naval threat consists not of ships, subs, or aircraft, but of mines-and pirates.11

### China Adv

#### Their UQ doesn’t make any sense—if the US embargo is the sole reason that Cuban oil hasn’t been developed it means that other countries wouldn’t have invested

**And alt causes to US Cuba relations**

#### A) Political views

Hanson and Lee 13 (Stephanie and Brianna – Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31, http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113)

What is the main obstacle in U.S.-Cuban relations? A fundamental incompatibility of political views stands in the way of improving U.S.-Cuban relations, experts say. While experts say the United States wants regime change, "the most important objective of the Cuban government is to remain in power at all costs," says Felix Martin, an assistant professor at Florida International University's Cuban Research Institute. Fidel Castro has been an inspiration for Latin American leftists such as Venezuelan President Hugo Chávez and Bolivian President Evo Morales, who have challenged U.S. policy in the region.

#### B) Human Rights, Guantanamo, and Cuban exiles

Hanson and Lee 13 (Stephanie and Brianna – Council on Foreign Relations, “U.S.-Cuba Relations”, 1/31, http://www.cfr.org/cuba/us-cuba-relations/p11113)

What are the issues preventing normalization of U.S.-Cuba relations? Experts say these issues include: Human rights violations. In March 2003, the Cuban government arrested seventy-five dissidents and journalists, sentencing them to prison terms of up to twenty-eight years on charges of conspiring with the United States to overthrow the state. The Cuban Commission for Human Rights and National Reconciliation, a Havana-based nongovernmental group, reports that the government has in recent years resorted to other tactics besides prison --such as firings from state jobs and intimidation on the street-- to silence opposition figures. A 2005 UN Human Rights Commission vote condemned Cuba's human rights record, but the country was elected to the new UN Human Rights Council in 2006. Guantanamo Bay. Cuba indicated after 9/11 that it would not object if the United States brought prisoners to Guantanamo Bay. However, experts such as Sweig say Cuban officials have since seized on the U.S. prison camp--where hundreds of terror suspects have been detained--as a "symbol of solidarity" with the rest of the world against the United States. Although Obama ordered Guantanamo to be closed by January 22, 2010, the facility remains open as of January 2013, and many analysts say it is likely to stay in operation for an extended period. Cuban exile community. The Cuban-American community in southern Florida traditionally has heavily influenced U.S. policy with Cuba. Both political parties fear alienating a strong voting bloc in an important swing state in presidential elections.

#### C) The rest of the Embargo – the plan is only a fraction

Hanson 13 (Daniel – economics researcher at the American Enterprise Institute, “It's Time For The U.S. To End Its Senseless Embargo Of Cuba”, 1/16, http://www.forbes.com/sites/realspin/2013/01/16/its-time-for-the-u-s-to-end-its-senseless-embargo-of-cuba/)

While the embargo has been through several legal iterations in the intervening years, the general tenor of the U.S. position toward Cuba is a hardline not-in-my-backyard approach to communism a la the Monroe Doctrine. The official position is outdated, hypocritical, and counterproductive. The Cuban embargo was inaugurated by a Kennedy administration executive order in 1960 as a response to the confiscation of American property in Cuba under the newly installed Castro regime. The current incarnation of the embargo – codified primarily in the Helms-Burton Act – aims at producing free markets and representative democracy in Cuba through economic sanctions, travel restrictions, and international legal penalties.

#### No China conflict – no military use

Aliison & Blackwill 13 -- \*director of the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs and Douglas Dillon Professor at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government AND \*\*Henry A. Kissinger Senior Fellow for U.S. foreign policy at the Council on Foreign Relations (Graham and Robert, 1/28/2013, "Beijing Still Prefers Diplomacy Over Force," http://www.cfr.org/china/beijing-still-prefers-diplomacy-over-force/p29892)

As China has become a leading export market for its neighbours, it expects them to be "more respectful", in Mr Lee's words. In public statements, China usually downplays the advantages its size begets, but in a heated moment at a 2010 regional security meeting, its foreign minister had a different message: "China is a big country and other countries are small countries and that is just a fact." Mr Lee has a phrase for this message: "Please know your place." Unlike free-market democracies, in which governments are unable or unwilling to squeeze imports of bananas from the Philippines or cars from Japan, China's government can use its economic muscle. As tensions mount over competing claims for contested territories, should we expect Beijing to use military force to advance its claims? From the perspective of the grand strategist, the answer is no – unless it is provoked by others. "China understands that its growth depends on imports, including energy, and that it needs open sea lanes. They are determined to avoid the mistakes made by Germany and Japan," Mr Lee says. In his view, it is highly unlikely that China would choose to confront the US military at this point, since it is still at a clear technological and military disadvantage. This means that, in the near term, it will be more concerned with using diplomacy, not force, in foreign policy. Henry Kissinger, the western statesman who has spent most quality time with Chinese leaders in the past four decades, offers a complementary perspective. As he has written, their approach to the outside world is best understood through the lens of Sun Tzu, the ancient strategist who focused on the psychological weaknesses of the adversary. "China seeks its objectives," Mr Kissinger says, "by careful study, patience and the accumulation of nuances – only rarely does China risk a winner-take-all showdown." In Mr Lee's view, China is playing a long game driven by a compelling vision. "It is China's intention," Mr Lee says, "to be the greatest power in the world." Success in that quest will require not only sustaining historically unsustainable economic growth rates but also exercising greater caution and subtlety than it has shown recently, in order to avoid an accident or blunder that sparks military conflict over the Senkakus, which would serve no one's interests.

#### -- Chinese leadership will pull back

Ross 1 (Robert S., Professor of Political Science – Boston College, The National Interest, Fall, Lexis

The strategic costs to China of a war with the United States are only part of the deterrence equation. China also possesses vital economic interests in stable relations with the United States. War would end China's quest for modernization by severely constraining its access to U.S. markets, capital and technology, and by requiring China to place its economy on permanent war-time footing. The resultant economic reversal would derail China's quest for "comprehensive national power" and great power status. Serious economic instability would also destabilize China's political system on account of the resulting unemployment in key sectors of the economy and the breakdown of social order. Both would probably impose insurmountable challenges to party leadership. Moreover, defeat in a war with the United States over Taiwan would impose devastating nationalist humiliation on the Chinese Communist Party. In all, the survival of the party **depends on preventing a Sino-American war.**

#### -- History proves no risk of China war – their cards are all hype

Dyer 9 (Gwynne, Ph.D. in War Studies – University of London and Board of Governors – Canada’s Royal Military College, “China Unlikely to Engage in Military Confrontation”, Jakarta Post, 4-29,

http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2005/03/12/china-unlikely-engage-military-confrontation.html)

Given America's monopoly or huge technological lead in key areas like stealth bombers, aircraft carriers, long-range sensors, satellite surveillance and even infantry body armor, Goss's warning is misleading and self-serving. China cannot project a serious military force even 200 miles (km) from home, while American forces utterly dominate China's ocean frontiers, many thousands of miles (kilometers) from the United States. But the drumbeat of warnings about China's ""military build-up"" continues. Just the other week U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld was worrying again about the expansion of the Chinese navy, which is finally building some amphibious landing ships half a century after Beijing's confrontation with the non-Communist regime on the island of Taiwan began. And Senator Richard Lugar, head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, warned that if the European Union ends its embargo on arms sales to China, the U.S. would stop military technology sales to Europe. It will come as no surprise, therefore, that the major U.S. defense review planned for this year will concentrate on the rising ""threat"" from China, or that this year for the first time the joint U.S.-Japanese defense policy statement named China as a ""security concern"", or that the Taiwan government urged the ""military encirclement"" of China to prevent any ""foreign adventures"" by Beijing. It comes as no surprise -- but it still makes no sense. China's defense budget this year is 247.7 billion yuan: Around US$30 billion at the official exchange rate. There are those in Washington who will say that it's more like $60 billion in purchasing power, but then there used to be ""experts"" who annually produced hugely inflated and frightening estimates of the Soviet defense budget. Such people will always exist: to justify a big U.S. defense budget, you need a big threat. It's true that 247.7 billion yuan buys an awful lot of warm bodies in military uniform in the low-wage Chinese economy, but it doesn't actually buy much more in the way of high-tech military systems. It's also true that the Chinese defense budget has grown by double-digit increases for the past fourteen years: This year it's up by 12.6 percent. But that is not significantly faster than the Chinese economy as a whole is growing, and it's about what you have to spend in order to convert what used to be a glorified peasant militia into a modern military force. It would be astonishing if China chose NOT to modernize its armed forces as the rest of the economy modernizes, and the end result is not going to be a military machine that towers above all others. If you project the current growth rates of military spending in China and the United States into the future, China's defense budget catches up with the United States about the same time that its Gross Domestic Product does, in the late 2030s or the early 2040s. As to China's strategic intentions, the record of the past is reassuring in several respects. China has almost never been militarily expansionist beyond the traditional boundaries of the Middle Kingdom (which do include Tibet in the view of most Chinese), and its border clashes with India, the Soviet Union and Vietnam in the first decades of Communist rule generally ended with a voluntary Chinese withdrawal from the disputed territories. The same moderation has usually applied in nuclear matters. The CIA frets that China could have a hundred nuclear missiles targeted on the United States by 2015, but that is actually evidence of China's great restraint. The first Chinese nuclear weapons test was forty years ago, and by now China could have thousands of nuclear warheads targeted on the U.S. if it wanted. (The United States DOES have thousands of nuclear warheads that can strike Chinese targets.) The Beijing regime is obsessed with economic stability, because it fears that a severe downturn would trigger social and political upheaval. The last thing it wants is a military confrontation with its biggest trading partner, the United States. It will go on playing the nationalist card over Taiwan to curry domestic political favor, but there is no massive military build-up and no plausible threat of impending war in East Asia.

#### -- US/China war will be limited – no escalation

Record 1 (Dr. Jeffrey, Professor of Strategy and International Security – Air War College and Senior Research Fellow – Center for International Strategy, Technology, and Policy, “Thinking About China and War”, Aerospace Power Journal, 12-6, <http://www.airpower.maxwell.af.mil/airchronicles/apj/apj01/win01/record.html>)

Assuming the absence of mindless escalation to a general nuclear exchange, a war between China and the United States would be **constrained** by **limited military capacity** and **political objectives**. For openers, neither China nor the United States is capable of invading and subjugating the other, and even if the United States had the ability to do so, avoidance of a land war on the Asian mainland has long been an injunction of American strategy. The objectives of a Sino-American war over Taiwan or freedom of navigation in the South China Sea would be limited—just as they were in the Sino-American war in Korea. And since the outcome in either case would be decided by naval and air forces, with regular ground forces relegated to a distinctly secondary role, a war over Taiwan or the South China Sea would also be limited in terms of the type of force employed. This was not the case in the Korean War, in which ground combat dominated. (To be sure, the US position on the ground would have been untenable without air dominance.)

#### AND Cross-strait relations better than ever – no conflict

Paal 12 -- vice president for studies at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace (Douglas, 6/12, "Taiwan: Outlook for Cross-Strait Relations," http://carnegieendowment.org/2012/06/12/taiwan-outlook-for-cross-strait-relations/bkih)

With the inauguration of Taiwan President Ma Ying-jeou for his second and final four-year term in May, cross-strait relations appear more stable than they have been in more than sixty years. That does not mean, however, that observers should expect further big steps to improve relations between Taipei and Beijing. We are entering an era of limited aspirations and restrained expectations. On the home front, by contrast, Ma announced in his inaugural address an ambitious reform program that is already encountering some stiff resistance. Ma repeated his campaign promise calling for a “golden decade” built on five pillars of reform: economic transformation, creating employment and realizing social justice, green energy, invigorating culture, and development of Taiwan’s most important resource, its human talent. In cross-strait relations, the outlook is only for incremental improvements. Taiwan expects to expand its preferential trade arrangements with the mainland, establish representative offices on the mainland and Taiwan to manage relations, complete an investment protection agreement, expand educational opportunities in both directions, and advance cooperation against crime. Despite their limited scope, these will be politically sensitive and tricky to implement without triggering negative reactions.

#### Miscalc is impossible

Quinlan 2009

[Sir Michael, visiting professor at King's College London, Permanent Under-Secretary at the Ministry of Defence and former senior fellow at the International Institute of Strategic Studies, “Thinking About Nuclear Weapons: Principles, Problems, Prospects,” Oxford University Press]

One special form of miscalculation appeared sporadically in the speculations of academic commentators, though it was scarcely ever to be encountered—at least so far as my own observation went—in the utterances of practical planners within government. This is the idea that nuclear war might be erroneously triggered, or erroneously widened, through a state under attack misreading either what sort of attack it was being subjected to, or where the attack came from. The postulated misreading of the nature of the attack referred in particular to the hypothesis that if a delivery system—normally a missile—that was known to be capable of carrying either a nuclear or a conventional warhead was launched in a conventional role, the target country might, on detecting the launch through its early warning systems, misconstrue the mission as an imminent nuclear strike and immediately unleash a nuclear counter-strike of its own. This conjecture was voiced, for example, as a criticism of the proposals for giving the US Trident SLBM, long associated with nuclear missions, a capability to deliver conventional warheads. Whatever the merit of those proposals (it is not explored here), it is hard to regard this particular apprehension as having any real-life credibility. The ﬂight time of a ballistic missile would not exceed about thirty minutes, and that of a cruise missile a few hours, before arrival on target made its character—conventional or nuclear—unmistakable. No government will need, and no nonlunatic government could wish, to take within so short a span of time a step as enormous and irrevocable as the execution of a nuclear strike on the basis of early-warning information alone without knowing the true nature of the incoming attack. The speculation tends moreover to be expressed without reference either to any realistic political or conﬂict-related context thought to render the episode plausible, or to the manifest interest of the launching country, should there be any risk of doubt, in ensuring—by explicit communication if necessary—that there was no misinterpretation of its conventionally armed launch.

### Solvency

#### No commercially viable oil in Cuba – companies are backing out

Gibson 4/14 (William – Washington Bureau, “Companies abandon search for oil in Cuba's deep waters”, 2013, http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2013-04-14/news/fl-cuban-oil-drilling-retreat-20130414\_1\_jorge-pi-north-coast-cuban-officials)

After spending nearly $700 million during a decade, energy companies from around the world have all but abandoned their search for oil in deep waters off the north coast of Cuba near Florida, a blow to the Castro regime but a relief to environmentalists worried about a major oil spill. Decisions by Spain-based Repsol and other companies to drill elsewhere greatly reduce the chances that a giant slick along the Cuban coast would ride ocean currents to South Florida, threatening its beaches, inlets, mangroves, reefs and multibillion-dollar tourism industry. The Coast Guard remains prepared to contain, skim, burn or disperse a potential slick. And Cuban officials still yearn for a lucrative strike that would prop up its economy. A Russian company, Zarubezhneft, is drilling an exploratory well in shallower waters hugging the Cuban shoreline south of the Bahamas. But though some oil has been found offshore, exploratory drilling in deep waters near currents that rush toward Florida has failed to reveal big deposits that would be commercially viable to extract, discouraging companies from pouring more money into the search. "Those companies are saying, 'We cannot spend any more capital on this high-risk exploration. We'd rather go to Brazil; we'd rather go to Angola; we'd rather go to other places in the world where the technological and geological challenges are less,'" said Jorge Piñon, an oil-industry analyst at the University of Texas who consults with U.S. and Cuban officials as well as energy companies. "I don't foresee any time in the future exploration in Cuba's deep-water north coast. It is, for all practical purposes, over."